



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
04/807,034	12/09/85	IBODOR	N 023800-002

NORMAN H. STEPHEN
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHEWS
GEORGE MASON BLDG.
WASHINGTON & PRINCE STS., P. O. BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
ROBERTS, E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
125	4
DATE MAILED: 03/26/86	

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 4. Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-51, 56-63 and 65-114 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims 7, 46-51 and 90 are allowed.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-45, 56-63, 65-89 and 91-114 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

8. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are acceptable;
 not acceptable (see explanation).

10. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____.
has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation). However,
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are
corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received
 been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Art Unit 125

The claims now in the case to be acted upon are 1-51, 56-63, and 65-114.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-6, 8-45, 56-63, 65-89 and 91-114 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Phillipps et al (1) (2) and Edwards in combination with Sarrett et al .

The primary references disclose the 17 β -carboxylates-17 α -hydroxy and/or acyloxy- antiinflammatory steroids of the androst an series. The Sarett patent shows the conventionality of modifying hydroxy substituent with oxy-carboxyl-oxy substituents at the 17 α -position of the steroid nucleus.

Modification of the compounds shown by the primary references with a carbonate ester at C-17 α -position,

Art Unit 125

as recited in the claims, would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with the references of record before him. Hence, the claims are precluded from patentability by the statute. The composition claims as well as the method of use claims would be equally as obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 7, (46-51) and 90 are allowable as presently advised. ^{OK} ₄₆₋₅₁ ^{EJ}

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE 3mos FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER.

Roberts/k1

703/557-3920

3-22-86


Albert L. Roberts
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 125